

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

<b>BARBARA ANDERSON,</b>	)	<b>CASE NO. 1:22-CV-00627</b>
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	<b>JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT</b>
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	
	)	
<b>GREGORY THOMPSON, <i>et al.</i>,</b>	)	<b>ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE</b>
	)	<b>JUDGE'S REPORT AND</b>
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>

This matter comes before the Court upon the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Thomas M. Parker. The Report and Recommendation (ECF #136), issued on March 13, 2024, is hereby ADOPTED by this Court.

On January 3, 2024, Defendant Gregory Thompson filed in this Court a “Motion for Default” (ECF #125) relating to the alleged non-payment of a \$500 sanctions award Anderson was ordered to pay to Thompson pursuant to a Judgment issued by the Court on August 16, 2023 (ECF #123). On March 2, 2024, Plaintiff Barbara Anderson filed in this Court a “Motion to Strike Docket 131 and to Strike the \$500 Judgment as Waived and/or Pursuant to this Court’s Inherent Authority” (ECF #132) related to the Judgment.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>

ECF Docket Entry #131 was titled “Response to DKT #129,” and entered on the Docket as *Response to Court Order Filed by Gregory A. Thompson*.

On February 21, 2024, this Court had entered an order referring Defendant Thompson's "Motion for Default" (ECF #125) to Magistrate Judge Thomas Parker for Report and Recommendation. (Non-Docket Entry Related to ECF #125).

This case has a rather long and convoluted history, as indicated in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, culminating in this dispute over whether Anderson has paid the \$500 Judgment amount to Thompson, followed by continued exchanges between the parties after referral.<sup>2</sup>

As a result of subsequent post-referral orders issued by the Magistrate Judge, (ECF #126, #129, #134), and the parties' various responses, (ECF #127, #128, #130, #131, #132, #133, #135), it was confirmed that Anderson has sent the \$500 sanctions award to an account controlled by Thompson. (ECF #136, p. 3, PageID #654).

Accordingly, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the "Motion for Default" (ECF #125) be DENIED as MOOT, and that all of the other non-relevant "prayers for relief" identified in the multitude of subsequent responses be disregarded. (ECF #136, p. 3, PageID #654). The Report and Recommendation thus also recommends that "Thompson's prayers for additional relief and Anderson's motion to strike (ECF Doc. 132) should be DENIED." (ECF #136, p. 3, PageID #654).

Neither party has since filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge's March 13, 2024 Report and Recommendation (ECF #136); nonetheless, the Court has reviewed *de novo* the Report

---

<sup>2</sup>

As stated colorfully in the Report and Recommendation, "After referral of the instant dispute, these two erstwhile lovers ironically flooded the court with several examples of their incessant, vituperative, nitpicking bloviation, nearly all of which was irrelevant to the matter referred." (ECF #136, p. 3, PageID #654).

and Recommendation, *see Ohio Citizen Action v. City of Seven Hills*, 35 F. Supp. 2d 575, 577 (N.D. Ohio 1999), and ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation in its entirety.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



---

DONALD C. NUGENT  
United States District Judge

DATED: April 2, 2024